REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 25 and 26 are now present in this application.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10 and 25 have been amended, and claim 26 has been added. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-5, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over ROTH, U.S. Patent 5,826,329, in view of Japanese document 2-74095. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6, 7 and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over ROTH and the Japanese document '095, and further in view of MOSHER, Jr., U.S. Patent 5,973,600. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As has previously been noted, the patent to ROTH discloses a method of making printed circuit boards using thermal transfer techniques. In this method, the received board 14 is a fiberglass board or laminate, as set forth in column 2, lines 43-44. There is no suggestion in this arrangement that a method for forming radio frequency tags on paper or film is contemplated.

The present invention, on the other hand, is directed to a method of forming radio frequency tags. This has now been expressly recited in the preamble of each of the claims. In independent claim

1, the receiver substrate was recited as being paper or film. As set forth in claim 1, this receive substrate is flexible. The Examiner has taken the term "film" and alleged that the receiver substrate 14 of ROTH can be broadly read as film. However, previously claim 1 recited that the received substrate was flexible. This was not the case with the printed circuit board of ROTH. Claim 1 has now been amended to also recite the film as pliable. This again just re-emphasizes that the receiver substrate is flexible, unlike the arrangement of ROTH.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method which expressly includes the method step of using paper or pliable film as a received substrate. In the transferring step of claim 1, the composition is transferred to the paper or film receiver substrate.

This is unlike the rigid, fiberglass board disclosed in the ROTH patent. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's broad reading of the term "film" is inappropriate in light of the recited claim language. Again, a flexible receiver substrate is either the paper or film. One working in the paper industry would not look to the semiconductor industry. One trying to make radio frequency tags on paper or film would not look to the teachings of ROTH. This is non-analogous art and would not teach the method steps as recited in independent claim 1.

With regard to dependent claim 3, the Examiner takes the position that column 3, lines 48-65 of ROTH teach an electrically

conductive precursor. It seems, however, that the Examiner is actually referred to lines 11-15 of column 3 of the ROTH patent. There, it is stated that the coating 50 is an electrically conductive coating. In the present invention, on the other hand, the electrically conductor precursor is non-conductive. However, it becomes electrically conductive upon application of heat from the heat source. ROTH only teaches the use of a non-conducting polymer, however, it is filled with electrically conductive pigments. An electrically conductive coating formulation with conductive polymers such as poly(sulfer nitride), polythiozyl and cis-polyacetylene doped with AsF_5.

Dependent claim 26 goes on to further bring out the use of sorbital copper formate, copper sulfate, cuprite, tenorite, and silver nitrate as a reactive material. Nowhere in the prior art utilized by the Examiner is this arrangement taught. With the present invention, the metallic salts which are employed are generally poor conductors which must be reduced by heating to form the conductive materials.

It is noted on page 5 of the Office Action that the claims are not considered to recite "radio frequency tags". This has now been expressly set forth by the foregoing amendments. All claims recite this feature.

Finally, regarding the patent to MOSHER, Jr., this only identifies a microchip or antenna, and does not teach the invention

or teach printing using electrically conductor precursors which are non-conductive but which become conductive material. It is respectfully submitted that the prior art utilized by the Examiner would neither suggest nor render obvious the independent method claim 1 or its dependent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

In the event the Examiner does not consider this application to be in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered for the purposes of Appeal. This Amendment should overcome the current grounds of rejection and therefore simplify the issues for Appeal. This Amendment should not raise new issues, since the changes all seem to have been considered by the Examiner at least in the remarks of the last Office Action. Nonetheless, it should be unnecessary to proceed to Appeal because the instant application should now be in condition for allowance.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____
Joe McKinney Muncy, #32,334

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

KM/asc
0011-0368P